

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES MICHAEL PAPAZIAN,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. DOERER,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-01182-HBK (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AND MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

(Doc. Nos. 13, 15)

Plaintiff, a federal prisoner incarcerated at United States Penitentiary, Atwater, proceeds pro se in this civil action on his First Amended Complaint. (Doc. No. 4). On February 28, 2024, Plaintiff filed a response to the Court's December 20, 2024 Order to Show Cause (Doc. No. 14) along with three motions: a motion for class certification¹ (Doc. No. 12); a motion for extension of time (Doc. No. 13); and a motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 15).

Plaintiff seeks a "standing" 90-day extension of time for "anything filed in this case." (Doc. No. 13). Currently, there are no pending deadlines in this case. Thus, a standing 90-day extension of time for all deadlines is unnecessary. Furthermore, the Court does not give "standing" 90-day extensions of time. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) provides for extending deadlines for good cause shown, if the request to extend time is made before the

¹ The Court will address Plaintiff's motion for class certification by separate order.

1 existing deadline. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). If made after the time has expired, a party must
2 also show excusable neglect. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B). To the extent that Plaintiff is unable to
3 comply with a court-ordered deadline, he may move for an appropriate extension of time
4 explaining the reason needed for the extension, as appropriate. Indeed, Plaintiff previously
5 requested, and was granted, an extension of time to respond to a Court Order. (See Doc. Nos. 8,
6 9).

7 Plaintiff also requests the Court to “reconsider any court orders or rulings in this case until
8 it receives Plaintiff’s responses.” (Doc. No. 15). Plaintiff has timely responded to the Court’s
9 December 20, 2024 Order. (Doc. No. 14). At this time, there are no orders or rulings to
10 reconsider. Thus, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is unnecessary.

11 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

12 1. Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time (Doc. No. 13) is DENIED.
13 2. Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 15) is DENIED as unnecessary.

14
15 Dated: March 10, 2025


16 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28